

# *Appendix B*

## *Strategy Development*

The Department of Fish and Game contracted the Wildlife Health Center at the University of California, Davis, to manage the strategy development process and to prepare the report and Web publications. The Wildlife Health Center created the Wildlife Diversity Project to manage the strategy development. The strategy development process involved regional workshops, scoping meetings, regional consultations, conservation-action workshops, and peer review.

The required content elements for the strategy report include wildlife science, policy, and management issues. The status of wildlife species and their habitats, the nature of stressors affecting wildlife, and research and monitoring needs are primarily scientific issues. Developing conservation actions appropriate to reduce or mitigate problems and stressors affecting wildlife involves integrating scientific, policy, and management considerations.

To address scientific issues, the Wildlife Diversity Project utilized information from regional workshops, scoping meetings, regional expert consultations, and reviews of key wildlife studies and conservation documents. Current conservation activities, wildlife management and policy issues, and conservation actions were discussed in regional workshops, in consultations with regional experts, and in conservation-action workshops.

### **Scientific and Technical Input**

Regional scoping meetings (November 2003–March 2004)—Regional meetings were held with Fish and Game wildlife biologists and managers to develop lists of major stressors of wildlife habitats and important conservation activities in each region.

Regional consultations (February 2004–March 2005)—In each region of the state, about 20 to 30 conservation planners, ecologists, federal, state, and local biologists and land managers, representatives of conservation organizations, and other local experts were consulted.

Review of conservation plans and scientific literature (February 2004–May 2005)—Relevant wildlife studies, publications, and conservation planning documents pertaining to each region were reviewed. This review provided background regarding wildlife stressors and past and current conservation activities.

Fish and Game Statewide Review Team (March–April 2005)—Fish and Game scientists from each region of the state reviewed portions of the draft report and provided input regarding wildlife stressors and conservation actions.

Regional peer review groups (April–May 2005)—Regional peer-review groups of four to six reviewers each reviewed portions of the draft report and commented on the status of species and stressors and on technical, scientific, management, and policy considerations of the conservation actions.

## Stakeholder Input

California Legacy Project's bioregional stakeholder workshops (2002–2003)—The Legacy Project held nine, two-day-long regional "Spotlight on Conservation" workshops to discuss conservation issues, plans, priorities, and monitoring needs. Various stakeholder interests were represented by the participants in these workshops, including local, state, and federal agencies, businesses and building industry representatives, environmental nongovernmental organizations, and farming, ranching, and forestry interests. The workshop results provided regional perspectives on wildlife conservation. The workshop proceedings, including information on regional conservation plans, priorities, strategies, monitoring, management, and stewardship projects, available resource data, and recommended strategies, were compiled in regional workshop reports. Legacy workshop reports are available on the Web at <http://legacy.ca.gov>.

Conservation action workshops (March–May 2005)—Seven conservation action workshops, with participants representing local, state, and federal agencies, nongovernment organizations, and various stakeholder interests, were held to discuss major issues and actions important to conserving and restoring wildlife.

## Additional Stakeholder Input and Public Participation

Most of the conservation actions recommended in this report, if implemented, would be reviewed further through well-established public participatory processes such as the California Fish and Game Commission review process, the State Water Resources Control Board hearing process, U.S. Forest Service or BLM resource management planning processes, county planning commission and board of supervisors review

processes, or legislative hearings. Conservation actions would also comply with public review requirements pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act and the National Environmental Protection Act.